REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is in response to the Office Action having a mailing date of November 23, 2005. Claims 1-12 are pending in the present Application. Applicant has added claims 13-14. Consequently, claims 1-14 remain pending in the present application.

Applicant has added claims 13-14, which recite that the identity of the boot source includes the location of a particular number of instructions first executed. Support for the new claims can be found in the specification, page 6, lines 1-10. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added.

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,678,833 (Grawrock) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,161,177 (Anderson).

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Claim 1 recites:

> 1.   A method for evaluating a boot source in a computer system having a processor comprising:
> determining the boot source used by the processor each time the computer system boots, the boot source determining further including writing an identity of the boot source; and
> allowing the boot source to be specified once as a known boot source.

> 6.   A system for evaluating a boot source in a computer system having a processor coupled with a boot source, the system comprising:
> a first register for storing an identity of the boot source used by the processor each time the computer system boots; and
> a second register for allowing the boot source to be specified once as a known boot source.

Thus, the method and system recited in claims 1 and 6 provides a trusted boot source. Moreover, the method and system recited in claims 1 and 6 allow the trusted boot source to be verified. In particular, the identity of the boot source, for example a location of the boot source, is

stored. Specification, page 8, lines 12-13. Thus, the source, or location, of the instructions that are actually executed can be provided and independently verified. Specification, page 8, lines 13-15. Consequently, a trusted boot source can be reliably provided. Specification, page 8, lines 15-16. Moreover, Applicant notes that an **identity** of the boot source, rather than an *identifier* of the boot source are stored.

As previously argued, Grawrock discloses storing an identifier (the boot block identifier) for the boot source, not the identity of the boot source. Grawrock specifically describes this boot block identifier as being a hash of "boot information." Grawrock, col. 3, lines 57-61. Grawrock further states that the "boot information" is basically an image or series of sub-images that collectively represent the boot block code. Grawrock, col. 3, lines 45-50. Thus, the boot information corresponds to the boot code itself rather than an identity of the boot source. Because the boot block identifier of Grawrock is a hash of the boot information, the boot block identifier of Grawrock merely corresponds to the contents of (instructions in) the boot source. The boot block identifier of Grawrock does not correspond to the identity of the boot source, but merely corresponds to the boot code. Grawrock thus fails to teach or suggest the recited writing of the boot block identity.

Anderson fails to remedy the defects of Grawrock. Anderson is concerned with ensuring that the central processing unit (CPU) and BIOS are compatible. Anderson, Abstract. Anderson thus describes a system that reads "identifying data" for the BIOS. Anderson, col. 4, lines 50-54. However, this identifying data is merely sufficient to determine whether the BIOS and hardware correspond to the same central processing unit and chip set. Anderson, col. 2, line 65-col. 3, line 20. Thus, Anderson specifically states that the identifying data is used to "specify. . . the CPU or other chip set components corresponding to the BIOS program, i.e., the CPU that the BIOS

program was designed to be executed by or the chip set components that the BIOS program was designed to operate with . . ." Anderson, col. 3, lines 5-10. This identifying data is, therefore, distinct from the identity of the boot source. Thus, like Grawrock, Anderson fails to describe writing the identity of the boot source, for example to a register.

Because both Grawrock and Anderson fail to describe writing the identity of the boot source, any combination of Grawrock and Anderson would fail to teach or suggest this feature. Stated differently, if Grawrock and Anderson were combined, the combination might determine the "identifying data" of Anderson. Consequently, the combination might use a hash of the instructions as well as data that indicates to which CPU or chip set the instructions correspond. However, the combination would still not store the *identity* of the boot source. Consequently, Grawrock in view of Anderson fail to teach or suggest the method and system recited in claims 1 and 6, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 6 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 2-5 and 13 depend upon independent claim 1. Claims 7-12 and 14 depend upon independent claim 6. Consequently, the arguments herein apply to claims 2-5 and 7-14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-5 and 7-14 are allowable over the cited references.

Applicant's attorney believes that this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

__February 23, 2006__
Date

/Janyce R. Mitchell/ Reg. No. 40,095
Janyce R. Mitchell
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(650) 493-4540